UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/448,804	11/24/1999	DAVID L. SALGADO	D/99253-690	5473
2512 Perman & Gree	7590 03/08/201 een. LLP)	EXAMINER	
99 Hawley Lan	e		PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R	
Stratford, CT 06614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/08/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/448,804	SALGADO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	

	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 24 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	out prior to the data of filing a brick	will make a sectional ba	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Sathyanarayan Panna Primary Examiner, Art U		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant filed on 2/24/2010 amendment after Final Office Action by amending claims 1 and 3 to overcome claims objection. The amendment will be entered and the claims objection is withdrawn.

Applicant's argument regarding claims 1 and 2 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) stated as "there is absolutely on disclosure of computer readable medium there or anywhere in Fujiwara." In response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Fujiwara do teach in Fig. 2 and 3 as element 240 as Non-volatile memory and further detailed-out in the Fig. 3 as the software components of the computer readable memory.

Further, Applicant argued regarding claim 1 rejection using the prior art Fujiwara as "there is no disclosure of a system manager or a platform controller." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Fujiwara do teach as "computer software programs typically include a series of instructions that control operation and functionality of computer system", which is the same as the claim and the specification of the current invention (see col. 1. lines 20-23).

Further, Applicant argued as "there is no disclosure since possess is not the same as collect." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner respectfully diagrees for equating wrong words. Applicant is requested to interpret properly. Examiner considered as "selecting attributes" for "collecting attributes".

Applicant's argument regarding claims 3 and 12 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) stated as "Teare does disclose 'polling' that is not the same as 'collecting'." Again, in response to Applicant argument, Examiner thanks applicant for agreeing that the prior art do teach the claimed subject matter. Whenever applicant tries to misuse well known words, and not defined properly, Examiner will have the opportunity to use broadest and reasonable interpretation as per MPEP.

Therefore, Examiner rejection of claims in the final Office Action is maintained.